Opr :



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

i i				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/528,456	03/17/2000	Martin Kienzle	YOR000028US1	4380
75	590 08/18/2004		EXAM	INER
Frank Chau Esq			ARANI, TAGHI T	
F. Chau & Asso	ociates LLP		A DOWN DAY	DARED MILANCE
1900 Hempstea	d Turnpike		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Suite 501	•		2131	
East Meadow,	NY 11554		DATE MAN ED 00/10/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

٠ *	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/528,456	KIENZLE ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Taghi T. Arani	2131				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee may be been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:  3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections:	tion(s)					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would	· · · ——	eparate timely file	d amendment			
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-34</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/2004 regarding the rejection of the claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103() have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's attempt to distinguish the claims from prior art is based on noting the lack of a teaching of "a first unit and a second unit of the data stream wherein at least one first unit using an encryption key and embedding the encryption key into at least one second unit for the data stream". The Examiner disagrees with the Applicant in that lchikawa does disclose encrypting data by a sender using a key (ABSTRACT, lines 3-41). Ichikawa also discloses encrypting the key by the sender using an asymmetric encryption algorithm and transmitting it to the user. The authorized user decrypts the encrypted key using the encryption algorithm and then uses the key to decrypt the encrypted data. As stated in the rejection for claims 1, 20, and 33, Ichikawa does not disclose a steganography method. Orrin discloses the steganography method/system. Orrin embeds the key into a secondary data stream to be sent to the user to then be extracted and used to decrypt the cyphedext (ABSTRACT, lines 5-6 and 8-12). Thus, Ichikawa combined with Orrin do disclose "encrypting at least one first unit using an encryption key" and "embedding the encryption key into at least one second unit for the data stream", referring to claims 1, 20 and 33.

' AYAZ SHEIKH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100